

[CONTINUED FROM FOURTH PAGE.]
that may hereafter be entered into by persons in
the Government, or by any other body, to provide the fu-
ture existence of such a condition by the people of the United
States through their representatives in the Congress of the United
States.

Such were the opinions which Mr. Webster then expressed, and such the resolutions of the Legislature of Massachusetts, with which he agreed. Yet he now professes to wonder what anybody can see any difference between the dispositions of those two sets of resolutions, and those of his speech delivered on the 7th of March.*

6. MISSTATEMENT OF FACT, IN REGARD TO FUGITIVE SLAVES.

Mr. Webster says that previous to writing his Newburyport letter, he made diligent inquiry of members of Congress respecting the law, to ascertain how many cases of fugitive slaves had been brought before him; and he adds, "the result of all I can learn is this: No seizure of an alleged slave has ever been made in Maine."¹

Now, two such cases have happened in the State of Maine. One was in the winter past of 1850, or '51. The other happened at or near Thomaston, a little later. In this latter case, the fugitive came to Maine in a Thomaston vessel, whose master was afterwards demanded as a fugitive from justice. This demand gave birth to a long and tedious suit, which involved no less than three Governors of Maine. This correspondence was extensively circulated through the newspapers, or referred to by them, and it would seem hardly possible that Mr. Webster should not have known it. Since the New statement of fact has been made in the Maine newspapers, yet no retraction is made. The misstatement is allowed to be spread over the whole country, uncorrected by its author. Mr. Webster then adds, "No seizure of an alleged fugitive slave has ever been made in Vermont." From this, and I believe authentic history, contradict Mr. Webster here. It is said "by members of Congress" from Vermont that an alleged fugitive was carried before Judge Harrington of Vermont in 1807, and after being tried, was condemned to work for him until the master was a slave, he replied, "a bill of sale from Almighty God."

But even if these statements of Mr. Webster, with regard to the New England States, were all true, it would not affect his position, especially from the Friends of Pennsylvania. He says that they remain "of sound and disposing minds and memories," and he contrasts their wisdom and compunction with the "vehement and emphatic denunciations" of those who have so long disturbed and so much disgraced the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. He then adds, "I am misled by authority which ought not to be relied upon; if it be not true, that is a great blot upon the information which you have received." Then he asks, "Is it possible not to be 'materially erroneous'?" It is "materially erroneous," and though one error has been exposed in the Maine papers, he does not rectify it. Possibly, he does not know it.

7. FURTHER MISSTATEMENT OF FACT.

While holding Massachusetts up to reprobation for "allowing the Pennsylvanians to sing songs, to draw slaves, to encourage and support from the Society of Friends, and especially from the Friends of Pennsylvania." He says that they remain "of sound and disposing minds and memories," and he contrasts their wisdom and compunction with the "vehement and emphatic denunciations" of those who have so long disturbed and so much disgraced the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. He then adds, "I am misled by authority which ought not to be relied upon; if it be not true, that is a great blot upon the information which you have received." Then he asks, "Is it possible not to be 'materially erroneous'?" It is "materially erroneous," and though one error has been exposed in the Maine papers, he does not rectify it. Possibly, he does not know it.

8. RENEWING SUBSCRIPTIONS.

We hope each old subscriber, as his subscrip-

tion closes, will remember that by sending us five dollars, we may renew his own subscription, and secure two copies of the paper besides, for new subscribers.

SKETCHES OF OUR VILLAGE.

We ask attention to the series of animated, most agreeable sketches, the first of which we publish in this week's paper. They are from the pen of MARTHA RUSSELL, already a favorite with our readers.

It will be seen, by reference to our advertise-

ments, that persons in almost any of the States,

having legal papers to be acknowledged, deposi-

tions taken, &c., in the city of Cincinnati, can

have them attended to at the office of Birney & Pearce. We are confident that everything of the kind committed to them will be promptly attend-

ed to.

CONGRESS ON TUESDAY.

In the Senate, the report of the Committee of Thirteen being under consideration, several amendments were rejected, among them, one pro-

posing to abrogate the Mexican laws in the Territories. Some discussion arose between Messrs. Yulee and Poole, the latter vindicating himself against a charge of inconsistency brought by the former.

The House refused to go into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and pro-

ceeded to dispose of the business on the Speaker's table.

NEW CABINET.

D. Webster, (Mass.) Secretary of State.

T. Corwin, (Ohio) Secretary of the Treasury.

A. J. Pearce, (Md.) Secretary of the Interior.

W. A. Graham, (N. C.) Secretary of the Navy.

E. Bates, (Mo.) Secretary of War.

N. K. Hall, (N. Y.) Postmaster General.

J. C. Crittenden, (Ky.) Attorney General.

The nominations were sent to the Senate last Saturday, and confirmed the same day in Executive session.

Sectionally viewed, there is nothing to complain of—the President and three of his Cabinet are from the non-slaveholding States, and four from the slaveholding.

The West has a larger share than has generally fallen to her lot—furnishing three members. Three are taken from the Senate, and this we regard as unfortunate. Members of Congress ought to be ineligible to any office, during the term for which they are chosen, and for two years thereafter.

The Cabinet is an able one, and with a single exception, highly creditable to the President. It will doubtless sustain Mr. Fillmore in his adhesion to the policy of General Taylor, and his maintenance of the rights of the United States against sectional opposition.

But, what shall be said of the appointment of Mr. Webster to the State Department? We had hoped that Mr. Fillmore would not encumber himself with any of the tribe of politicians to whom Mr. Webster belongs—and especially that he would not interpose between that gentleman and the constituency whose will he had so far disgruntled. No matter on what condition Mr. Webster goes into the Cabinet, not only will he do his best to maintain the Executive in the vindication of the rights of New Mexico, still the odium that attaches to him, in consequence of his desert of a great measure, deeply cherishes him in the South, and the whole North, will be shared to some extent by the Cabinet of which he is a member.

That is it, his opinion that it would be better to take up the admission of California, and then proceed with the other measures, one at a time—and yet, it is his opinion that by pursuing this course, we should "very little relieve ourselves from the embarrassment," so that he is "decidedly—decidedly in favor" of acting upon all these measures. That is the question?

Mr. Webster presents no new considerations in support of his assumption that the Wilmot Proviso is unnecessary; so that it is likely Massachusetts will continue unconvinced, retaining her faith in the necessity of positive law in favor of Freedom. She will remember that Slavery has never been abolished in this country, or, limited, without the enactment of positive law—that it has always gone, where it has not been prohibited; that there is no latitude, no clemency, no soil, in which it has not prevailed. She will remember that the great question in controversy between Slavery and Freedom, since the time when acquisitions from Mexico were first mediated, has been this, "Will it?"

What is it, his opinion that it would be better to take up the admission of California, and then proceed with the other measures, one at a time—and yet, it is his opinion that by pursuing this course, we should "very little relieve ourselves from the embarrassment," so that he is "decidedly—decidedly in favor" of acting upon all these measures, together, not separately?

Without comment on this apparent confusion of ideas, we may ask, why is not Mr. Webster found side by side with Mr. Benten, in pursuing the manly, reasonable, ordinary mode of legislation; that of acting and deciding upon each great measure, by itself, in reference to its own merits?

Why has he not from the beginning conformed his course of action to what he deems has been his opinion from the beginning—that it would be better to proceed by measure by measure, instead of attempting to dispose of all the questions in one bill?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Some time since, Mr. Foote, denouncing with severe indignation the action of the People of New Mexico, in the organization of a State Government, claimed that Messrs. Clay, Cass, and Webster, had announced their unwillingness to vote for the admission of the new State. Those gentlemen heard, but did not contradict him.

Some time since, Mr. Foote, denouncing with severe indignation the action of the People of New Mexico, in the organization of a State Government, claimed that Messrs. Clay, Cass, and Webster, had announced their unwillingness to vote for the admission of the new State. Those gentlemen heard, but did not contradict him.

It is his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that it would be better to act upon all the measures together, not separately?

Again, is it his opinion that

were soon at his disposal. Their united efforts were unavailing. After lingering till eleven o'clock on Tuesday night, the great statesman expired, in the 83d year of his age.

The event caused a great sensation in England and France. The English papers are filled, almost to the exclusion of everything else, with the tenets of the life and character of the late Premier. They are speculating as to the effect it will have upon the politics of his country. In reply to an offer by Lord John Russell, in the name of her Majesty and the nation, of a public funeral, the family declined the honor, inasmuch as it would be Robert's last wish that he should be buried in Drayton Abbey, with all the pomp and circumstance of a private funeral.

In the House of Lords on Monday night, the Ministry suffered another defeat, by a majority of twenty-two, on the trial of Francis, Earl of Westmorland. The proposal was that the bill should be regulated by an £8 qualification, and Lord Stanier proposed an amendment that the qualification be £15 instead. The amendment being carried, and the principle of the bill destroyed, the bill was withdrawn.

They were also withdrawn by Lord Liverpool, the Earl of Ireland, the Marquess of Lansdowne, and the amended Incumbered Estates' bill. They have announced their determination stick to the budget, and, if needs be, appeal to the country upon it.

Our correspondent supplies us in another place with a general view of European intelligence.

Mr. PEACE, appointed Secretary of the Interior, has declined that appointment. He was constitutionally ineligible—the office having been created during his term of service in the Senate.

Mr. CORNWELL, we learn, enters the Cabinet with extreme reluctance; and, for one, we are extremely sorry that he should be persuaded to leave the Senate.

FOREIGN CORRESPONDENCE.

Paris, July 4, 1850.

To the Editor of the *National Era*.

The debates in the Assembly have been quite interesting for a week past. Two or three trifling checks to the Ministry on the law way, and one much more important on the Mayors' bill. The Assembly refused, by a large majority, to put this bill on the order of the day for Thursday. As this is a clear intimation of its intended rejection, the Ministry will probably withdraw it until a more favorable season. The bill against the press will be up for discussion in a few days. A tax of a cent and one-fifth is proposed to be levied on each number of the papers published in Paris. The probabilities are that the bill will pass.

The sudden death of Sir Robert Peel, and the late laurel ascent of Messrs. Bixio and Barro, are the chief topics of conversation in Paris. After these come the failure in the attempts to unite the two branches of the house of Bourbons, the dinner given to M. Girardin by the workmen of *Le Presse*, the quarrels of the Legitimists among themselves, the intention of the President to finish the *Cit de l'Orangerie*, or laborers' lodging-house, out of his own funds, the duel of Messrs. Valentin and Clary, two members of the Assembly, and the aquittal of a democratic paper, by the Paris jury. All these details are uninteresting, and I will dismiss them here, in order to take up the news from the other parts of the European continent.

GERMANY.

The affairs of this much-divided country are as complicated as ever, and as much in the dark. An occasional ray of light thrown on some parts, serves to show the tangled and intricate state of the whole. The interminable affair of the Duchies of Schleswig-Holstein is as far from a solution as ever. Denmark has sent in her ultimatum to Prussia, but no answer has been received. Six months ago, I indicated to you the probability that Prussia would finally abandon the cause of the Duchies, and leave them to struggle alone against Denmark. This is as probable now as then, and the delay interposed by the Prussian diplomatists seems to have no other cause than to avoid the appearance of abandoning allies, and also to avoid offending the public sentiment of the free cities of North Germany, which sustain with enthusiasm the cause of the Duchies. These cities once safe in the Prussian League, and the Duchies will be left to their fate. The late communications of the Danish Cabinet to the *Landesregierung*, or National Assembly, on this subject, show that England and Russia are both on the side of Denmark. The power of Europe is not likely to be disturbed by the question of Schleswig-Holstein. If any one wishes to inform himself on a question which has many interesting features, he will find a good pamphlet on it, edited by our late fellow-citizen, Mr. Wheaton.

The negotiations between Austria and Prussia have been broken off and resumed a second time. This play between the Powers is becoming ridiculous—they having quarreled and made friends at least a dozen times during the last two years. The object of this seems to be to force the different German States to take part with one or the other, and thus further what is doubtless their great plan, the entire supremacy of these two States in Germany.

This Congress is doing absolutely nothing. The Constituent Assembly of Wurtemberg re-assembled on the 27th ult. Its first act was to order the impeachment of M. Wachter Spittel, Minister of Foreign Affairs, for high treason. The vote stood 50 for, and 11 against. His crime is having conspired with Austria to bring back Germany to the Constitution of 1815. The President of the Assembly was charged with the execution of the order of the Assembly. This act is one aimed at the King himself, who is quite as guilty as his minister. He has sent the letter to Paris as Minister Plenipotentiary of Wurtemberg, until the storm blow over. The day after the above vote, the Cabinet demanded a law authorizing the collection of taxes for four months, and authorized this for two months only.

The Cabinet of the King of Hanover resigned on the 27th ult., for reasons not known.

SPAIN.

A note inserted in *El Espanol*, a Madrid paper, in the number of the 25th ult., contradicts the report of the disturbance of the usual friendly relations between Spain and the United States.

PORUGAL.

The Pope has been celebrating the anniversary of his elevation to the Papacy. A great number of small coins were distributed among the poor, and a great many medals and crosses of honor conferred on the soldiers. Each man of the Swiss guard received a medal, on which was engraved the word "Fidelitas." The funeral of the soldiers who fell in attacking Rome, was celebrated with masses and processions of priests. While the capital is employed in festivities and ceremonies, the provinces of the Roman States are in great disorder. In some of them the misery of the people is so great, that the peasants have formed themselves into bands of brigands, for the pillage of the rich country seats of the nobles. These have most of them fled to Rome, or to foreign countries; others remain, but keep near them a number of armed men for the protection of their property.

The constitution of Naples has been entirely abolished by the King, and he is now compelled to his despotism.

In the prolonged absence of the Grand Duke of Tuscany at Vienna, a strong party has been formed against him and the Austrian influence. The Ministers, sustained by the Austrian troops which

garrison the Duchy, now with alarm at the increased popularity of the revolution, are endeavoring to recall the Piedmontese ambassador. Their two organs in the press are *Il Statuto* and *La Costituzionale*, the ablest papers at Florence. The course of the latter paper has been so aggressive that the Minister of State, who is a man of considerable talents, gave up his post two weeks ago, the position of the Duke of Lucca, to leave Tuscany. The Duke of Piedmontese ambassador protested against this violence. The Grand Duke has sent for his Prime Minister to join him at Vienna. The pretext for this is a consultation with the Austrian Government on the subject of a railroad system in Italy.

The members of Parliament are trying to conciliate the democratic party of Italy. Their internal and external policy is marked with a certain liberality which differs widely from their acts of last year.

Mr. Seward presented the proceedings of a public meeting held in the State of New York in opposition to this bill.

Mr. Hale presented a petition from colored inhabitants of Allegany County, Pennsylvania, setting forth that they have no record evidence of their freedom, and praying that the Legislature of Thirteen would amend the bill.

Mr. Foote moved to amend the bill.

Mr. Gwin proposed an amendment that the

would have drawn a picture which, compared with the original, had presented a scene, would have made it appear faint and feeble indeed.

"Sir, I have seen all this within these last few days—not in this chamber, of course; but it is a fact, nevertheless; and, while such incongruity lies together, to my taste, it is rather to be blamed than to be praised."

"I must say, that, in my opinion, it is a fact, that those who compose this meeting are failing to find fault with the 'incongruity' in opposition to this bill. So far as I am concerned, I will agree to go square upon the matter, and we won't twit on either side. I leave that part of the subject."

CONGRESS.

THIRTY-FIRST CONGRESS—FIRST SESSION.

SATURDAY, JULY 18, 1850.

The resolution to admit the editors of the *Southern Press* to the floor of the Senate coming up.

Mr. Hale moved to amend, by adding the words "and the editor of the *National Era*?"

Mr. Hale saw no necessity for the amendment of Mr. Hale, as the *Era* was a weekly paper, and the *Press* a daily. A weekly paper could make no difference.

Mr. Seward opposed the motion of Mr. Hale.

Mr. Seward presented the proceedings of a public meeting held in the State of New York in opposition to this bill.

Mr. Hale presented a petition from colored inhabitants of Allegany County, Pennsylvania, setting forth that they have no record evidence of their freedom, and praying that the Legislature of Thirteen would amend the bill.

Mr. Hale moved to amend the bill.

Mr. Gwin proposed an amendment that the

would have drawn a picture which, compared with the original, had presented a scene, would have made it appear faint and feeble indeed.

"Sir, I have seen all this within these last few days—not in this chamber, of course; but it is a fact, nevertheless; and, while such incongruity lies together, to my taste, it is rather to be blamed than to be praised."

"I must say, that, in my opinion, it is a fact, that those who compose this meeting are failing to find fault with the 'incongruity' in opposition to this bill. So far as I am concerned, I will agree to go square upon the matter, and we won't twit on either side. I leave that part of the subject."

The debate was then postponed till tomorrow.

Berrien, Bradbury, Bright, Butler, Cass, Clay, Cooper, Davis of Mississippi, Davis of Dickenson, Dodge of Wisconsin, Foote, Fitch, Garrison, Hinman, Jones, King, Mangum, Mason, Morton, Norris, Pearce, Pratt, Rusk, Sebastian, Soule, Sturgson, Turner, Underwood, Webster, and Yule—36.

Ames, Folger, and Tracy, voted out the tenth and eleventh lines, and the word "eastwardly" in the twelfth line, and insert "where the 34th degree of north latitude intersects salt river, thence east with said parallel of latitude."

Also voted on the seventh section, by adding the words "providing for a territory in the southern part of the State of California, with her consent."

The subject was then postponed till tomorrow.

THURSDAY, JULY 18, 1850.

The resolution to admit the editors of the *Southern Press* to the floor of the Senate coming up.

Mr. Hale moved to amend, by adding the words "and the editor of the *National Era*?"

Mr. Hale saw no necessity for the amendment of Mr. Hale, as the *Era* was a weekly paper, and the *Press* a daily. A weekly paper could make no difference.

Mr. Seward opposed the motion of Mr. Hale.

Mr. Seward presented the proceedings of a public meeting held in the State of New York in opposition to this bill.

Mr. Hale presented a petition from colored inhabitants of Allegany County, Pennsylvania, setting forth that they have no record evidence of their freedom, and praying that the Legislature of Thirteen would amend the bill.

Mr. Hale moved to amend the bill.

Mr. Gwin proposed an amendment that the

would have drawn a picture which, compared with the original, had presented a scene, would have made it appear faint and feeble indeed.

"Sir, I have seen all this within these last few days—not in this chamber, of course; but it is a fact, nevertheless; and, while such incongruity lies together, to my taste, it is rather to be blamed than to be praised."

"I must say, that, in my opinion, it is a fact, that those who compose this meeting are failing to find fault with the 'incongruity' in opposition to this bill. So far as I am concerned, I will agree to go square upon the matter, and we won't twit on either side. I leave that part of the subject."

The debate was then postponed till tomorrow.

THURSDAY, JULY 18, 1850.

The resolution to admit the editors of the *Southern Press* to the floor of the Senate coming up.

Mr. Hale moved to amend, by adding the words "and the editor of the *National Era*?"

Mr. Hale saw no necessity for the amendment of Mr. Hale, as the *Era* was a weekly paper, and the *Press* a daily. A weekly paper could make no difference.

Mr. Seward opposed the motion of Mr. Hale.

Mr. Seward presented the proceedings of a public meeting held in the State of New York in opposition to this bill.

Mr. Hale presented a petition from colored inhabitants of Allegany County, Pennsylvania, setting forth that they have no record evidence of their freedom, and praying that the Legislature of Thirteen would amend the bill.

Mr. Hale moved to amend the bill.

Mr. Gwin proposed an amendment that the

would have drawn a picture which, compared with the original, had presented a scene, would have made it appear faint and feeble indeed.

"Sir, I have seen all this within these last few days—not in this chamber, of course; but it is a fact, nevertheless; and, while such incongruity lies together, to my taste, it is rather to be blamed than to be praised."

"I must say, that, in my opinion, it is a fact, that those who compose this meeting are failing to find fault with the 'incongruity' in opposition to this bill. So far as I am concerned, I will agree to go square upon the matter, and we won't twit on either side. I leave that part of the subject."

The debate was then postponed till tomorrow.

THURSDAY, JULY 18, 1850.

The resolution to admit the editors of the *Southern Press* to the floor of the Senate coming up.

Mr. Hale moved to amend, by adding the words "and the editor of the *National Era*?"

Mr. Hale saw no necessity for the amendment of Mr. Hale, as the *Era* was a weekly paper, and the *Press* a daily. A weekly paper could make no difference.

Mr. Seward opposed the motion of Mr. Hale.

Mr. Seward presented the proceedings of a public meeting held in the State of New York in opposition to this bill.

Mr. Hale presented a petition from colored inhabitants of Allegany County, Pennsylvania, setting forth that they have no record evidence of their freedom, and praying that the Legislature of Thirteen would amend the bill.

Mr. Hale moved to amend the bill.

Mr. Gwin proposed an amendment that the

would have drawn a picture which, compared with the original, had presented a scene, would have made it appear faint and feeble indeed.

"Sir, I have seen all this within these last few days—not in this chamber, of course; but it is a fact, nevertheless; and, while such incongruity lies together, to my taste, it is rather to be blamed than to be praised."

"I must say, that, in my opinion, it is a fact, that those who compose this meeting are failing to find fault with the 'incongruity' in opposition to this bill. So far as I am concerned, I will agree to go square upon the matter, and we won't twit on either side. I leave that part of the subject."

The debate was then postponed till tomorrow.

THURSDAY, JULY 18, 1850.

The resolution to admit the editors of the *Southern Press* to the floor of the Senate coming up.

Mr. Hale moved to amend, by adding the words "and the editor of the *National Era*?"

Mr. Hale saw no necessity for the amendment of Mr. Hale, as the *Era* was a weekly paper, and the *Press* a daily. A weekly paper could make no difference.

Mr. Seward opposed the motion of Mr. Hale.

Mr. Seward presented the proceedings of a public meeting held in the State of New York in opposition to this bill.

Mr. Hale presented a petition from colored inhabitants of Allegany County, Pennsylvania, setting forth that they have no record evidence of their freedom, and praying that the Legislature of Thirteen would amend the bill.

Mr. Hale moved to amend the bill.

Mr. Gwin proposed an amendment that the

would have drawn a picture which, compared with the original, had presented a scene, would have made it appear faint and feeble indeed.

"Sir, I have seen all this within these last few days—not in this chamber, of course; but it is a fact, nevertheless; and, while such incongruity lies together, to my taste, it is rather to be blamed than to be praised."

"I must say, that, in my opinion, it is a fact, that those who compose this meeting are failing to find fault with the 'incongruity' in opposition to this bill. So far as I am concerned, I will agree to go square upon the matter, and we won't twit on either side. I leave that part of the subject."

The debate was then postponed till tomorrow.

THURSDAY, JULY 18, 1850.

The resolution to admit the editors of the *Southern Press* to the floor of the Senate coming up.

</div

